

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-21 are pending in the present application. Claim 8 has been amended. Claims 1, 8, and 13 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-5, 7, and 12-21 have been allowed by the Examiner.


Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,727,580 to Sakai (hereafter “Sakai”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the rejection, the Examiner relies on Sakai’s stereo demodulating circuit 16 for the claimed “audio signal demodulator” (see Office Action at page 3, 1st-2nd paragraphs). However, the Examiner further asserts that Sakai’s noise elimination circuit controller 19 is “independently configured to correct the detected noise in each audio signal, which is outputted from said audio signal demodulator [i.e., Sakai’s stereo demodulating circuit 16]” (Office Action at page 3, 3rd paragraph). Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to Fig. 1 of Sakai (reproduced below), which shows that the noise elimination circuit controller 19 does not process, or even receive, the audio signals (LAS and RAS) outputted by the stereo demodulating circuit 16. Instead, as shown in Fig. 1, Sakai’s noise elimination circuit controller 19 does not receive any type of audio signal. Instead, it receives the output of the switching control circuit 16, which controls the switching circuit 15 to choose either a pulse demodulated signal or ratio demodulated signal as the demodulated signal SDT (analogous to the claimed “demodulated signal”). See Fig. 1 below; also see col. 4, lines 3-36; col. 5, lines 38-42.

Fig. 1



In fact, as clearly shown in Fig. 1, Sakai fails to disclose any other circuit than the amplifier (21/22) and speaker (23/24) that receives an audio signal (LAS/RAS) that is outputted by the stereo demodulating circuit 18. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in Sakai of performing noise correction on a signal corresponding to a particular channel, as claimed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the Examiner's reliance on Sakai's noise elimination circuit controller 19 to teach the claimed "corrector" is improper because the noise elimination circuit controller does not perform correction on, or otherwise process, any signal output by the audio signal demodulator.

While no further amendment is necessary to distinguish the claimed invention over Sakai, Applicants have amended claim 8 in an effort to even further clarify the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 8 to recite "at least one corrector configured[] to receive the audio signals respectively corresponding to the plurality of channels outputted from the audio signal demodulator, and independently correct the detected noise in each of the audio signals outputted from the audio signal demodulator according to the detected noise." Such amendment is being made in an effort to expedite prosecution and, in no way, is acquiescence to the current ground of rejection. Neither Sakai's noise elimination circuit controller 19, nor any

other element in Sakai, receives an audio signal outputted from the audio signal demodulator (i.e., stereo demodulating circuit 18) and independently corrects the detected noise in such signal, as presently claimed. Thus, Sakai fails to provide a teaching for each and every feature recited in claim 8.

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Sakai fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned features of claim 8. Thus, independent claim 8 is allowable over Sakai, and claims 10 and 11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 8. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai in view of Japanese Patent Publication JP 11-186924 to Tsuji (hereafter Tsuji). It is respectfully submitted that Tsuji fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sakai set forth above in connection with independent claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 8. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the present application in an effort to expedite prosecution.

Application No. 09/617,086
Amendment dated October 9, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2007

Docket No.: 0649-0753P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By *Jan Rul* #47,305
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant